



Nominations Committee of the Barbican Centre Board

Date: MONDAY, 20 NOVEMBER 2017
Time: 10.45 am
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members: Deputy Dr Giles Shilson (Chairman)
Deputy John Tomlinson (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Tom Hoffman
Deputy Edward Lord
Trevor Phillips
Deputy Tom Sleigh

Enquiries: Gregory Moore
tel. no.: 020 7332 1399
gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk

N.B. Part of this meeting could be the subject of audio or visual recording.

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA**

3. **MINUTES**

To approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 July 2017.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 2)

4. **SKILLS AND EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW 2017**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 3 - 14)

5. **QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

6. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

7. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION – That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items, on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of Exempt Information, as defined in Part 1, of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

For Decision

8. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2017.

For Decision
(Pages 15 - 16)

9. **APPOINTMENTS TO THE BOARD**

The Managing Director to be heard.

For Information

10. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

11. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE BARBICAN CENTRE BOARD **Wednesday, 12 July 2017**

Minutes of the meeting of the Nominations Committee of the Barbican Centre Board
held at Committee Rooms, West Wing, Guildhall on Wednesday, 12 July 2017 at
3.30 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Dr Giles Shilson (Chairman)
Deputy John Tomlinson (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Tom Hoffman
Deputy Edward Lord
Trevor Phillips
Deputy Tom Sleigh

Officers:

Sir Nicholas Kenyon	-	Managing Director Barbican Centre
Greg Moore	-	Town Clerk's Department

1. **APOLOGIES**
There were none.
2. **MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA**
There were none.
3. **MINUTES**
The public minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2017 were approved as a correct record.
4. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
5. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
There were no urgent items.
6. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
RESOLVED – That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item No.
7 - 9

Paragraph No.
1 & 3

7. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2017 were approved as a correct record.

8. **PROSPECTIVE BOARD APPOINTMENTS**

The Managing Director was heard concerning prospective Board appointments.

9. **REVIEW OF SKILLS AND EXPERTISE**

The Committee considered and approved a report of the Town Clerk proposing a review of the Board's skills and areas of expertise, with a view to informing future recruitment.

10. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

11. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There were no urgent items.

The meeting ended at 3.40 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Gregory Moore
tel. no.: 020 7332 1399
gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee(s):	Date(s):
Nominations Committee of the Barbican Centre Board Barbican Centre Board	20 November 2017 20 November 2017
Subject: Skills and Effectiveness Review 2017	Public
Report of: Town Clerk Report Author: Greg Moore	For Decision

Summary

Members of the Barbican Centre Board have recently undertaken a skills and effectiveness review. This review asked Members to comment on various aspects around the work of the Board and the management of meetings. It explored Members' understanding of the Board's role, the input into and quality of meetings, the governance and clerking support received by the Board, and Members' thoughts on communication from the Centre. It went on to assess personal attributes such as the level of training received by Board Members, the interaction of Board Members with the Centre and its affiliates outside of formal meetings, and the skills and expertise that Members feel they bring to the Board.

The results of the survey are annexed to this report and Members will note that the data is split in to red, amber and green areas. A short summary analysis of the results is also provided in the body of this report for your consideration.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to note the contents of this report and consider any areas they wish to highlight for further deliberation. It is also recommended that Members agree to instruct officers to develop an action plan with proposed measures to address the various issues highlighted by Members.

Main Report

Background

1. In July 2017, Members agreed that a Skills Audit should be undertaken in order to assess the current balance of expertise and knowledge on the Board and to inform future recruitment.
2. A survey was circulated in the summer following the meeting and a reminder issued at the September Board meeting. Following the receipt of responses, the results have now been collated and are attached as an appendix to this report.
3. A short summary analysis, outlining the primary issues or points for consideration raised by the responses, is also set out below.

Summary Analysis

Role and Vision

4. Responses suggest that the Board is content that the role and vision are sufficiently clear to Members, although perhaps a dedicated session explaining these, along with the Centre's strategic aims and objectives, would be beneficial for new Members – particularly given the differences between the role with the Barbican and traditional "Trustee" roles.
5. Members also expressed a clear desire to engage more with the Centre on-site – whether it be through regular visits, away-days, or spending time with particular teams. This would allow Members to get a greater feel for the activities underway at the Centre and, indeed, the day-to-day operation of the Barbican more generally – which would in turn allow for a greater appreciation of the role and facilitate improved input.
6. Several Members suggested that future appointments to the Board should be mindful of the need for increased experience of arts administration and programming – sentiments echoed by the responses to the Skills Audit.

The Board's Business

7. The results demonstrate that Members are generally satisfied with the administration of the Board, although there is a recognition that the reports – whilst of good quality – are, on occasion, overly lengthy.
8. They could also benefit from being geared towards facilitating more strategic discussions and greater Member input, with some Members feeling there was a surfeit of "for information" papers at present.
9. There was some reference to the structure of the agendas not allowing for strategic discussions to happen as effectively as could be hoped, although it was recognised that working within the confines of the City Corporation and general local authority regulations concerning public and non-public items placed difficult limitations on the latitude available to make changes here.
10. The timing of meetings was raised by two Members, one indicating a preference for a move to early or late meetings; another with reference to seeking to avoid overlaps with outside bodies.

Self-Assessment

11. Responses to the "self-assessment" questions indicated that Members are, perhaps, minded that they have the capacity to offer greater input if there were a mechanism to focus or facilitate this. This would suggest that there is work that the Clerk and the Management Team could explore in increasing Members' engagement with certain issues and exploring training requirements, so as to provide the right environment for this desire for increased participation to flourish.

Information and Communication

12. Induction of Members emerged as an issue for consideration, with the split of responses between longer-serving and new Members indicating that the Board's relatively newly-instituted induction process has been timely and well-received. However, it was clear that it would benefit significantly from further review and more focus – there is certainly more work to be done in increasing the effectiveness of this process.
13. The Board was broadly pleased with the general information and communications coming directly from the Barbican Centre, although it was felt that there was more scope to provide more Board-specific communications which might assist Members in their roles.

Skills Audit

14. The results of the skills audit demonstrate that the Board has a good balance of skills and interest in the majority of areas.
15. However, there are a number of areas where, despite a level of interest, there is perceived to be a lack of sufficient expertise – namely, Arts Administration, Dance, Unreached Audiences, and Visual Arts.
16. These findings accord with the general sentiments expressed at previous Nominations Committee meetings, as well as through the responses to the Survey, that there is a need for at least one individual with hands-on administrative and programming experience to bring a greater spread of skills and expertise to the Board.
17. Four areas were highlighted as lacking in both expertise and interest, i.e. Facilities Management, Health & Safety, Quality Systems and Marketing.
18. Although Marketing had previously been identified as an area of need by the Board and Nominations Committee, the remaining three areas represent subjects previously unidentified as in need of additional expertise. Members are invited to consider whether these represent real or significant “gaps” in the Board's knowledge; although it should be borne in mind that, given the format of the Survey and the limited number of responses Members were invited to provide, they may simply represent areas where Members felt it less of a priority to declare their interests (as opposed to, say, arts-specific options, which the responder might feel were more pertinent to the Barbican's needs).
19. Members may also wish to bear in mind that several of the areas in the Audit may not necessarily be identified as direct skills and, rather, could be mitigated through training opportunities.

Conclusion

20. The results are presented for Members' review and comment. Subject to the outcomes of your deliberations, it is suggested that the Board might wish to instruct officers to develop an action plan, with a view to resolving or mitigating again some of the issues raised.

21. It should be noted that some issues, such as more regular visits to (or interaction with) the Centre, are already the subject of ongoing work and will be factored into this action plan.

Appendices

- Results and analysis – Barbican Centre Board Skills and Effectiveness Review 2017

Gregory Moore

Principal Members' Services and Committee Manager

Town Clerk's Department

T: 020 7332 1399

E: gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Barbican Skills and Effectiveness Review Response Log

Question	Results	Comments
Role and Vision		
Is the role of the Board clear?	Yes = 90% Needs Improvement = 10%	Insufficient clarity, especially for external Members who may be used to a more typical "trustee" type role. We have been traditionally less hands-on / involved in creative decisions – whether this is by design or convention and may be up for change is another matter.
Do you understand the Barbican's vision, strategic aims and objectives and feel able to contribute to discussions?	Yes = 90% In part = 10%	
Is there any training or further information or training you feel would be helpful?	N/A (comment box question, unscored)	<p>Relatively new to the Board so am still working at getting familiar with the organisation.</p> <p>A dedicated session explaining the vision, strategic aims and objectives would be helpful for new Members.</p> <p>Useful for Members to visit the Centre other than for events – a regular back-of-house visit would be good.</p> <p>Away-days – these meetings held at the Centre are very useful and give us a better feel for all aspects of the Barbican Centre.</p>
Is there clarity regarding what decisions are expected of the Board?	Yes = 73% In part = 9% No = 9% Nil response = 9%	<p>There is little in the way of training / induction.</p> <p>Board papers are generally for information rather than for decision.</p>
Does the Board have sufficient skills, experience, time and resources to undertake its duties effectively?	Yes = 64% No = 27% Nil response = 9%	<p>When looking at future external appointments, experience running other arts organisations would be useful.</p> <p>We could benefit from more direct arts experience to give the Board a stronger voice on programming matters. Increased hands-on experience of digital arts delivery, social media and delivery of content would also be a benefit. We also lack strong international cross-border expertise.</p>

		<p>Steps are currently being taken to fill vacancies which will hopefully result in increased diversity and the appointment of someone with significant experience of working in the arts.</p> <p>We may need to think a little harder about our skills mix.</p> <p>More expectation of Corporation Members to attend should be necessary. We should not just be CV filling. Our independent Members are vital and another such could be very useful. Other bodies publish attendances.</p>
Does the Chairman have an effective leadership style?	Yes = 100%	<p>Giles is an excellent Chairman who includes Members in discussion, but still conducts the business expeditiously.</p> <p>Excellent chairing style.</p> <p>He controls the meeting and the agenda. Most courteous to Members and still manages to keep the momentum.</p>
The Board's Business		
Structure of Agendas	<p>Good = 55%</p> <p>Adequate = 27%</p> <p>Needs improvement = 9%</p> <p>Nil response = 9%</p>	<p>The Part A / Part B structure of City Board agendas is not conducive to structuring meetings effectively, i.e. putting together strategic matters for discussion and decision.</p> <p>Look to the quality of the papers of the 27/09 meeting. All committees could take note.</p>
Content of Committee Papers	<p>Good = 73%</p> <p>Adequate = 9%</p> <p>Needs improvement = 18%</p>	<p>Papers don't always direct us to meaningful strategic discussions – the Board could play a more active role in shaping strategy but the quasi-local government papers sometimes stifle this.</p> <p>The content of reports is good but written reports are often overly long – some guidance would be helpful, noting however that the need to split report content between public and non-public is a further complication.</p> <p>Long and too wordy. We need better executive summaries and more graphical depictions of stats, etc.</p>

		Look to the quality of the papers of the 27/09 meeting. All committees could take note.
Clarity of Minutes	Good = 100%	I'm impressed by the quality of the minutes. They are minutes and not blow-by-blow reports. They contain all necessary points and if not Members can correct them.
Timeliness of Agenda and Paper Circulation	Good = 90% Adequate = 10%	
Scheduling of Meetings	Good = 64% Adequate = 27% Needs improvement = 9%	Timings are very inconvenient for working Members – earlier or later in the day (perhaps working breakfast or tea) would make a big difference. We should also meet at least every other meeting at the Centre; cost aside there is a lot to be said immersing the Board in the Centre it is there to help govern. More thought could be given to avoiding conflict with meetings such as the Museum of London, as some Members serve on both.
Clerking Arrangements	Good = 100%	
Self-Assessment		
Meeting Attendance	Good = 73% Adequate = 18% Nil response = 9%	
Input at Meetings	Good = 27% Adequate = 64% Nil response = 9%	Hope to increase effectiveness as become more familiar with the organisation. Like some others, I think I fall into the trap of contributing only on my "special" subjects. We could all work harder to pitch in original ideas on matters which are not our areas of expertise – this could add some helpful perspectives. I make, I hope, appropriate comments as required. I read all papers and serve on a sub-committee too.
Interaction with the Centre outside of meetings	Good = 36% Adequate = 55% Needs improvement = 9%	I aim to do more now the electoral period has passed and I am settling into the Board.

		<p>I attend as many events as I can – I also walk through the Centre regularly to “experience” what visitors’ perception might be.</p> <p>I think there could/should be greater opportunity to engage with the Centre and understand the challenges it faces, especially issues which don’t come up at Board.</p>
How might your own performance be improved?	N/A (comment box question, unscored)	<p>Through more time/experience with the organisation.</p> <p>Through changes to meeting timings; additional training for Board Members; spending more time with the Barbican teams – Board Members can add real value out of the committee meeting itself.</p> <p>It takes time to get to know the management team and issues due to the size, constitution and scope of activities. A more structured induction programme should be considered and implemented – the current induction pack is useful but limited.</p> <p>More focused papers, clearer options for discussion / decision.</p> <p>Happy to attend any training if felt it might be useful.</p>
Information and Communication		
Did you have an induction meeting(s) on joining the Board?	Yes = 55% No = 45%	
Did you receive an induction pack?	Yes = 36% No = 55% Unsure = 9%	
Usefulness of communications from the Centre relevant to your Board responsibilities?	Good = 45% Adequate = 36% Needs Improvement = 9% Nil response = 9%	<p>Access to more data online could be useful, but would need to be carefully monitored to ensure content was relevant and appropriate to the Board’s role.</p> <p>Hard to say – we see what might be released publicly in advance, which is good; but I am not sure if we get much sense of the day-to-day inside the Centre or indeed inside the Corporation – obviously a bigger issue for external Members.</p> <p>More regular engagement needed.</p>

		I look forward to the press coverage.
Other communications from the Centre?	Good = 72% Adequate = 9% Nil response = 9%	It would be helpful for Board Members to automatically receive the weekly update Barbican members receive, perhaps with any extra points for the Board added so it is a co-ordinated and targeted communication.
General comments on effectiveness	N/A (comment box question, unscored)	<p>Effective, taking into account the unique structure of the Barbican and its relationship with the City Corporation.</p> <p>Much better than it was when I joined.</p> <p>Very good Board, well managed.</p> <p>Excellent, well-organised, chaired and clerked. Papers are extremely well-written but also very long. I am still finding my feet regarding my input and contribution and will discuss further with Nick and the Chair.</p> <p>It is well formed to undertake its responsibilities, and Board meetings reflect the broad range of skills and experience of Members.</p> <p>I believe we work well; I try to absorb all placed before us and make comments and suggestions / proposals at Board.</p>

Red = No Members scoring their interest / expertise highly, or a lone respondent rating their interest / expertise at a low level

Amber = Multiple Members scoring their interest / expertise at a low level, or a smaller number indicating interest / expertise highly

Green = Multiple Members scoring their interest / expertise highly

Skills Area	Expertise	General Interest
Arts Administration	Red	Amber
Charity Organisation	Green	Amber
Commercial	Green	Amber
Creative Learning	Amber	Amber
Dance	Red	Green
Digital	Green	Green
Equality Diversity & Inclusion	Green	Amber
Facilities Management	Red	Red
Film	Amber	Amber
Finance	Green	Amber
Fundraising	Amber	Amber
Governance/Trusteeship	Green	Amber
Health & Safety	Red	Red
Legal	Amber	Amber
Local Authorities	Amber	Amber
Marketing	Red	Red
Music	Amber	Amber

Other Business expertise (please state below)		
Personnel Matters		
Political Knowledge / Contacts (esp. in London)		
Project Management		
Property and Urban Realm		
Public Relations		
Public Sector Organisations		
Quality Systems		
Risk and Audit		
Theatre		
Unreached Audiences		
Visual Arts		

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank